

The Sun

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 1908.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month \$0 50
 DAILY, Per Year 5 00
 SUNDAY, Per Year 2 00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year 6 00
 DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month 70
 Postage to foreign countries added.

Published by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 150 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York. President and Treasurer of the Association, William M. Ladd, 150 Nassau street; Secretary of the Association, Franklin Harriet, 3 Nassau street.

The daily and Sunday SUN is on sale in London at Murray's Exchange, Trafalgar Buildings, Northumberland avenue, Pall Mall, and at the Strand, London. Sole agents, Messrs. Murray, 150 Nassau street, New York.

Paris office, 23 Rue Louis le Grand. The daily and Sunday editions are on sale at Kiosque 12, near the Grand Hotel, Kiosque 17, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Place de l'Opéra, and Kiosque 19, Boulevard des Capucines, corner Rue Louis le Grand.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have their articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

To the forty-six Governors, more or less, bid to Mr. Roosevelt's Congress now assembling at Washington: "Let us alone!"

The President's Collection of Governors.

So natural is the tendency and so laudable the disposition to find good in anything done or wanted to be done by Mr. ROOSEVELT that we fear there is danger of underestimating the mischievous possibilities of his conference of the Governors at Washington on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of this week.

At first view little appears that is not innocuous and even desirable in this gathering of State officers at the call of the Federal Executive. It is true there is a trace of the humorously audacious in the idea of a conference of the several representatives of the reserved powers of the States to devise means for enhancing Federal authority in various directions. If the occasion proves as successful as Mr. ROOSEVELT hopes, the convoked Governors will at least have helped mightily (if without knowing it) to pump more wind into that steadily increasing gale which Mr. STIMSON described the other day as "the cyclone of centralization." But apart from this political consideration, which has come to signify little or nothing to many minds once alert on the subject of boundaries and limitations, can the result of the conference of the Governors be other than to excite a greater popular interest in certain topics specified by Mr. ROOSEVELT as matters of importance to all the States and about which there can scarcely be two opinions? These matters are the destruction of our forests, the exhaustion of our mineral resources and the development of our interior waterways.

Let us pass over the destruction of our forests and the conservation of our mineral resources as subjects for cooperative thought by the forty-six Governors, and inquire what lies behind the apparently innocent presentation to these Governors of the President's policy for "the development of the nation's waterways."

In the pursuit of this inquiry we commend to the attention of all citizens certain ideas recently advanced by Mr. MILTON H. SMITH of Kentucky, for the past seventeen or eighteen years the president of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company. If to serve a railway is to be a malefactor, Mr. MILTON H. SMITH has passed through every grade of offence from juvenile perversity to hardened sin, for he began life as a clerk and telegraph operator in a superintendent's office and has worked his way up to the post he now holds. We trust that the Governors and others will consider his suggestions upon their merits only, unprejudiced by the record to which we have briefly referred.

The president of the Louisville and Nashville points out that the reasons given by Mr. ROOSEVELT for creating his Inland Waterways Commission, so called, and for recommending so persistently and strenuously legislation and enormous appropriations for the "development of our interior waterways by Federal activity and expenditure, were based originally upon the inadequacy of railway transportation facilities. That is to say, his waterway policy was inspired by conditions that have now notoriously ceased to exist.

This commission was created and this "policy" inaugurated in March of last year. On March 14, 1907, before the Roosevelt panic had relieved the transportation system of the country of any excessive strain upon its resources, the President designated certain gentlemen as members of the Inland Waterways Commission, explaining that he created that body because he had received petitions from "numerous commercial organizations in the Mississippi Valley." Later in a message to the Senate Mr. ROOSEVELT stated that the commission was created by him "in response to a widespread interest and demand from the people." We quote from the President's statement of March 14, 1907:

"It is common knowledge that the railroads of the United States are no longer able to move crops and manufactures rapidly to secure the prompt transaction of the business of the nation, and there is small prospect of immediate relief. Representative railroad men point out that the products of the northern interior have doubled in ten years, while the railroad facilities have increased only one-eighth, and there is reason to doubt whether any development of the railroads possible in the near future will suffice to keep transportation abreast of production. There appears to be only one complete remedy—the development of a complementary system of transportation by water."

Such was the reason, the only reason, alleged by Mr. ROOSEVELT for the inauguration of that special policy in which the forty-six Governors are to be invited tomorrow or next day to participate. Congestion of transportation facilities! With a pertinence and cogency from which the circumstance that he is a railway president in no way detracts, Mr. MILTON H. SMITH remarks:

"Several months before the communication of March 14, 1907, some of those connected with trans-

portation, and who realized the conditions under which the then congested state of traffic had been created, and the cause thereof, predicted that in a comparatively few months the transportation facilities would be in excess of the demands; that the congestion of which it is stated the people of the Mississippi Valley complained would be relieved. Some time before the message of February 26, 1908, was submitted, it was known of all that the transportation facilities were largely in excess of the demand, and that therefore for the time being the alleged reason for the creation of the Inland Waterways Commission—the lack of adequate transportation facilities—no longer existed."

Mr. SMITH shows furthermore that the statement attributed by the President to "representative railroad men," that where business had doubled transportation facilities had increased only one-eighth, or 12½ per cent., is ridiculously erroneous. During the period urged by Mr. ROOSEVELT as an illustration of the absolute need of a "complementary system of transportation by water," instead of increasing but 12½ per cent., he says, "such facilities were increased so that, with increased efficiency, the property moved in tons one mile increased 154 per cent. and passengers moved one mile increased 130 per cent.—passengers and property transported by electricity not included." But, as Mr. ROOSEVELT may with truth rejoin, this is a matter of mere figures and technicalities. With an equally impressive resort to generalities Mr. SMITH goes on to say:

"If the views of those who desire to return to the prosperous conditions that have existed for several years past are to obtain, and it is conceded that such conditions were largely due to the enormous expenditures made in the creation of additional transportation facilities, it is necessary that the citizens of this and other countries having capital to invest be in some way assured that investments in railway properties are reasonably secure. Under existing conditions this seems impossible, because the control of the properties has in various ways been taken from the owners. Labor unions, encouraged, promoted and protected by the highest representatives of the Government, have assumed control of the details of the management in a way that very materially increases the cost of operation and reduces the effectiveness of the service rendered, with no assumption of responsibility for the result. The United States Government, in addition to assuming authority to fix the remuneration to be received by the rail carriers, has adopted and is enforcing regulations that greatly embarrass the managements. And the end is not yet. Since the first of December, 1907, more than 200 bills intended to affect and increase the regulation of railways have been introduced and are now pending in Congress. The various States, or many of them, have enacted and are endeavoring to enforce numerous laws even more drastic than those of the United States; and onerous regulations are enacted and enforced by municipalities and other subdivisions of the Government, and none of them assumes any responsibility for the financial result. Does it not follow that those having capital to invest will refrain from investing it in property over which they or their representatives exercise practically no control, or when such control as they may exert may at any time be taken from them?"

When Mr. MILTON H. SMITH's questions are answered to the satisfaction of those business interests in the Mississippi Valley and elsewhere whose modest but heartfelt cry of "Let us alone!" is heard throughout the land, it will be time enough for the Governors to begin to consider Mr. ROOSEVELT's suggestions for relieving "congestion" on the railroads by the expenditure of several hundreds of millions of the people's money in the development of "a complementary system of transportation by water."

Dr. Aked and Mr. Sunday.

The message of the Rev. Dr. AKED to his congregation on Sunday seems to have been that Christianity is dying and can be nursed back to health and vigor only by the expenditure of large sums of money. With ample means at his disposal the churches, if he is correct, could sound a call that would bring men and women to the altar in such numbers as to reestablish completely its power in the land.

While Dr. AKED is lamenting the existing conditions a former baseball player, Mr. WILLIAM SUNDAY, is conducting a series of revival meetings in the middle West that have aroused a spirit most hopeful and encouraging for Christians of all denominations. Mr. SUNDAY's appeals have awakened in men and women of all classes, of all degrees of education and of all grades of intellect a devotion to CHRIST and the sect of their choice that has amazed and rejoiced those who sympathize with the cause which he represents.

Yet Mr. SUNDAY has no great endowment, no rich bank account. His converts joyfully defray the expenses of his revival meetings. His success is due to his apparent sincerity, to his ability to stir up in his auditors a realization of their responsibility to God and to bring them contrite and humble to the mourners' bench. He reaches their consciences, their hearts, their minds. His work is done without elaborate machinery, without the expensive adjuncts of the modern "institutional church."

Money the churches can use always; yet an examination of the extraordinary work of Mr. SUNDAY, who is affectionately known as BILLY, will convince Dr. AKED's congregation that money is not the only thing needed.

Forcing the Card.

"While it is inevitable," says the Cincinnati Commercial Tribune, "that Mr. BRYAN will be nominated at Denver, it would make not the slightest difference in results if Mr. JOHNSON should be named, or Judge GRAY. The universality of demand for the nomination of Mr. TAFT precludes the possibility of the election of any other candidate."

For months the Taft Republican organs have sung the song of the inevitability of BRYAN. Secretary TAFT himself in his amiable manner has frequently taken up the refrain and announced that BRYAN is to be the Democratic Presidential candidate. The New York Tribune, which has just abandoned Governor HUGHES as a Presidential possibility, first piped the lay many months ago. All over this broad land the Taft organs have chanted the chorus and as convention time approaches the home county organ of the Secretary pounds the pedal.

With the Democratic newspapers winking, blinking and sneering at BRYAN and openly opposing him, declaring that he is the weakest candidate for the Democracy to name, and with 75 per cent. of

the Democratic leaders, city, State and national, avowing that the great Game Money Nebraska—some speak of him also as the Patent Medicine Democrat—is the Old Man of the Sea for them and the Democracy, the Taft organs and the amiable Secretary continue to chant the certainty of BRYAN's nomination. They know an easy mark when they see it.

As late as Sunday the New York Tribune takes up the game again. Under the head "BRYAN in Pennsylvania" the Tribune remarks in the way of aid and comfort to the Bryanites:

"Pennsylvania is the keystone of the opposition within the Democratic party to Mr. BRYAN's renomination for the Presidency. The most sanguine anti-Bryan manager would hardly be rash enough to maintain that Eastern hostility to Mr. BRYAN's candidacy would be sufficiently formidable to give the national convention pause if it appeared that in the second largest Eastern State Mr. BRYAN had actually captured a majority of the delegation. Despatches from sources hostile to Mr. BRYAN have given the impression that only a handful of delegates favoring his nomination were elected at the Pennsylvania Congress district primaries on April 16. But this impression seems to have been entirely misleading. The Philadelphia Record, one of the strongest anti-Bryan newspapers in the United States, has taken the pains to canvass the situation and has found that in the thirty-two delegates to be elected (two delegates being tied for second place in one of the thirty-two districts) it reports that on the face of the returns Mr. BRYAN has a clear majority in his favor."

Also:

"We are not surprised that the Record, though entirely approving Mr. BRYAN's candidacy, equally disapproves the Goebel methods now being employed to manufacture an anti-Bryan delegation in Pennsylvania. The fact is that the leaders of the Bryan movement in that State have almost a monopoly of the brains and character left in the Democratic organization. Ex-Treasurer HENRY, the head of the Bryan League, is one Democratic since PATTERSON's day who has done the State a real service, and he has the respect of the people of Pennsylvania without regard to party. Associated with him are other Democrats who want to lift the organization from its present depth of degradation and make it a creditable and useful factor in politics. Every honest Democrat must sympathize with these aims, and the Record, if it has to choose between the clean Bryan element and the unclean anti-Bryan element, naturally prefers to stand for progress and decency, even if coupled temporarily with Bryanism. It takes the proper stand when it says that common honesty must be observed in party management, and come what may at Denver it will not be a party to nor will it condone the overturning of the popular will by any acts of treachery or bargain and sale."

One might be induced to believe that BRYAN is the candidate of the two Tribunes, New York and Cincinnati, and of their friends. But the trick of forcing a card on your opponent is as old as the hills.

Has Russia a Parliament?

As was to be expected, vehement protests were provoked by the assertion made the other day by Mr. KOKOTSEFF, Minister of Finance, that Russia's Duma is not a parliament. Mr. KHOMYAKOFF, the president of the chamber, at once denounced the remark as "an unfortunate expression," but subsequently he withdrew his stricture on the demand of Premier STOLYPIN, who threatened to resign. Mr. KOKOTSEFF also was persuaded by the Premier to withdraw his provocative statement, which, however, he endeavored to explain on the ground that the Duma does not entirely resemble other European parliaments, in which a majority of the popular chamber decides the fates of Ministers. Undoubtedly Russia now has a parliament, but this, like all other European parliaments except those of Greece, Norway, Bulgaria and Serbia, consists of two chambers, the appointed Council of the Empire being one and the elected Duma the other. Of course the Duma by itself no more constitutes a parliament than does the British House of Commons or the German Reichstag. Neither is it true, as Mr. KOKOTSEFF seems to imagine, that all parliaments to deserve the name must embody the principle of Ministerial accountability to the popular branch. The principle of Ministerial accountability was never distinctly recognized in England itself from the reign of EDWARD I. until the latter years of WILLIAM III, and it might never have gained a firm footing had not GEORGE I, who could speak no English, felt himself forced to confide in Sir ROBERT WALPOLE, who throughout that reign and much of the next commanded a majority of the House of Commons.

France, too, had a bicameral parliament under NAPOLEON I, and again under NAPOLEON III, but except in the last year of the latter's reign the principle of Ministerial responsibility to a majority of the lower house was not acknowledged. Moreover, nobody would deny that the present German Empire possesses a true parliament, composed of two chambers, the Bundesrath and the Reichstag; but never has the principle of Ministerial accountability to a majority of the last named chamber been conceded. The same thing may be said of the Austrian or Cisleithan Reichsrath and of the Hungarian Diet. The fact is that so far as Europe is concerned it is only in Britain, France, Italy, Spain and Norway that the principle of Ministerial accountability to a majority of the popular chamber may be said to be established. It is also obvious that when Mr. KOKOTSEFF denies the existence of a parliament in Russia on the ground alleged by him he might as well deny the existence of one in the United States, for notoriously our President is not obliged to select Ministers who can command the approval of a majority of the House of Representatives.

It is to be feared that Russia's public men are not so well informed as they might be concerning the history and workings of representative institutions. For that very reason it is of the utmost moment that the experiment in representative self-government should be continued and that the present Duma should not share the untimely fate of its two predecessors. Yet evidently such would be the case if the popular chamber and the Cabinet could not manage to work together. It follows that all those onlookers who wish Russia well must deem it fortunate that the leaders of the Constitutional Democrats and the Octobrists, who alone in the present Duma sincerely desire the maintenance of representative institutions, have

awakened to the fact that Premier STOLYPIN is their best friend. If they should quarrel with him they would do the very thing which the Reactionists are waiting for, for then Russia's trial of representative self-government would quickly come to an end.

Mr. Hurkett's Bad Quarter of an Hour.

The Senate of the United States in dealing with Mr. BURKETT's resolution providing that "Sunday, May 10, 1908, be recognized as Mothers' Day, and that it be observed as such by the members and officers and employees of the United States Senate wearing a white flower in honor of their mothers," discharged an unwelcome duty with more delicacy and good sense than Mr. BURKETT displayed when he imposed the duty upon the Senate.

It was natural that Senators old enough to be Mr. BURKETT's father should resent a proposal that they prove to the world by wearing a white flower on a certain day that they respected their mothers or the memories of their mothers. We can understand that Mr. BURKETT was bewildered at the reluctance of his associates to vote upon such a resolution or to discuss it, and how pained he must have been when Senator FULTON treated it with levity.

"If we are going to take up this line of legislative action I think we should stop by drawing the distinctions. I think we should have a father's day, and I think we should have a grandfather's day. Then perhaps we ought to bring in our cousins and our aunts or uncles. I can see no reason why we should make these invidious distinctions. At least, Mr. President, I think the matter should be taken under consideration and a committee should determine it. Everybody would agree that we should have a 'mother-in-law' day."

Heroic treatment perhaps, but Mr. BURKETT's notions of the province of the Senate are crude and the sentimentality he showered on unfilial sons like Mr. TELLER and Dr. GALLINGER was in very poor taste. It seemed to be a case for rough and ready sarcasm, since Mr. BURKETT was insensible to humble remonstrances and to simple avowals of parental affection wrung from scandalized Senators. Mr. TELLER did indeed say the resolution was puerile, but lightly his adjective glanced from the Burkett epidermis. Mr. KEAN's motion to substitute the Fifth Commandment seems to have been completely lost on the junior Senator from Nebraska, and the reason is obvious.

By reference to the Judiciary Committee the juvenile resolution was happily disposed of without putting any Senator on record against his maternal parent. "I ought to take but little time of the Senate," I realize I am a new member," said Mr. BURKETT in his passionate protest against the fate of his resolution. The newness of Senator BURKETT is appalling. It will take a long time and much adroitness and patience to make a sophomore of him.

The probable purpose of enrolling the year old Prince of the Asturias in the Spanish infantry was to give him a fair start in the race for promotion with the Doctors and Sons who will later be enrolled.

We have heard so much about the virility and ginger of Uncle Joe, as if he were the only really young man in Washington, that it is a relief to note the friskiness of Mr. Justice HARLAN at the planked shed outing of the District of Columbia Bar Association on Saturday. The Justice scored nine bullseyes out of twelve shots at the target and batted up flies and hit grounders until the talent of the bar association cried enough. May it be years before Justice HARLAN relinquishes either the rifle and the baseball bat or his place on the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Songs of a Patriotic Gentleman.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: By all means print "The Star Spangled Banner" in full in all your next issue, and by no means print "The American Flag" by Francis Hoffman Drake. Poor indeed is the patriotism of the American who would not have these soul stirring hymns of this great republic taught to American children. It is sad to reflect that most of the grognards have forgotten them.

When John Henry Newman wrote that definition of a gentleman quoted by Mr. Foster in your issue of yesterday he did not have patriotism in mind. I contend that a man can be a patriot and a gentleman at one and the same time, and he can sing the songs of his native land without damaging his gentlemanliness.

By the way, "Roll of Honor" is made up of pretty strong stuff—I wonder if Mr. Foster has ever read it. If he has perhaps he may think it worth while to petition the arbitration court at The Hague to induce France, who is supposed to be the best of the British schools, for you know, it might give offence to so many people; and while he is about it he might also include Rouget de Lisle's flamboyant "Marseillaise" of "unfaded bloody banner."

NEW YORK, MAY 11. FRANK H. VERNETZKY.

Enthusiasm for the Firemen.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: To James Brown, fireman of Hook and Ladder 18, let the people of New York look with pride. Only three months in the department, a "fourth grade" man, and the respect he effected at a tenement fire in Orchard street deserves more than passing mention. He sped up to the third floor rear, the fire raging beneath him, no streams playing from the rear, and there at the risk of his life saved the lives of two little ones.

Let some of our worthy citizens go down to Hook and Ladder 18 and interview them. They will feel proud of their being residents of New York.

NEW YORK, MAY 10. EDWARD M. SALOMON.

Columbus Day.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: There is a bill introduced by Representative Harrison, before Congress making October 12 a national holiday. This bill should interest every patriotic American citizen, for it is a strange fact that of our various holidays there is none commemorating the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

Had Columbus not landed on our shores we might never have had a Washington, a Lincoln or an Independence Day. It is but a fitting tribute to Columbus to have one day set aside in his honor.

NEW YORK, MAY 11. E. A. KRAUS.

Summer Plans.

Mother says with emphasis a boy had his little toes. She wants to find a bangup place in which to sport new clothes.

Father's taste is different—The hope within him buds That he may find a quiet spot Where he can wear old duds.

Sister but one thing exacts—Anywhere she goes—She would have to find a place contain A multitude of beaux.

Reconciling all the wants—Pathways need not fork. All they have to do is stay In little old New York.

MOLANDER WILSON

Appeal From Young America.

Mr. Burbank, if you please, Won't you grow some knobole trees So that fences may provide Lots of views of grapes laid?

POSTAL SAVINGS BANKS AND THE CONSTITUTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The debate in the Senate last week on postal savings depositories was interesting by reason of the novelty of the topic. Although it has been much written and talked of during a third of a century I had never heard it debated at close quarters.

Consideration of a proposed bill was presented by Mr. Carter, a Republican from Montana and a member of the Post Office Committee. Every other member of the committee was silent. No Democrat spoke during the discussion. Apparently solicited over the existence of a constitutional power in Congress to create the postal depositories, Mr. Carter said at the outset that "the Constitution vested in Congress the power to establish post offices and post roads and also the power to provide for the general welfare." He did not show a very visible link between the business of carrying the mails and using the postal machinery for accepting small or big deposits of money, paying interest thereon and restoring to the depositor his dues on demand. He seemed to rely on the vague "general welfare" clause.

The growth, present size and cost of the postal service were interesting features of the debate. Seventy-five hundred dollars of annual income and expenditure of this country is a quarter of a billion of each, with nearly a quarter of a billion of each, with \$7,000,000 of deficit in 1907 and \$20,000,000 of outlay in 1908, excluding cost of buildings, were straining figures. Not more impressive, however, than 68,176 existing post offices and as many postmasters, besides postal carriers and clerks, all presumably working for Taft's nomination. When one thinks of that electioneering force in a single Federal executive department it is difficult to understand how Democratic Congressmen can sincerely believe in the election of a tainted candidate like Bryan. The only plausible explanation is that they do not, and will be content with their own selection.

The plan is that a deposit may be made by anybody, young or old, with any postmaster of not less than \$1 or over \$1,000; the money is to be put by the postmaster in the nearest national bank, the depositor is to get 2 per cent. interest, the bank must pay 2½ per cent., the depositor is to be "public funds, exempt from taxation and service on legal process." The last feature caused much debate.

The bill is a contrivance to enable anybody to deposit money in national banks under the guarantee of repayment by the Federal Government on demand of the depositor. It was estimated in the debate that the deposits might average \$750,000,000 a year, liable to payment by the banks on demand.

The advantage in the Western States, where savings banks are few and inaccessible, of such a deposit scheme with postmasters under Government guarantee is obvious; but if constitutional for children, poor people and small sums, why not for grownups, the rich and large sums?

Very early in the interesting discussion occurred the following conversation:

Mr. Dixon—I do not want to dignify the orderly proceedings of the Senate by presenting this matter. It is certainly very interesting in its theory to me, but the thing about the postal savings bank proposition which has puzzled my mind is, under what theory of delegated or implied powers the Federal Government has the right to enter into this matter of postal savings banks. I should be glad if the Senator will take that matter up at this time or later on in his address.

Mr. Carter—I shall be glad at this time to briefly state that in my opinion Congress has ample power under the general welfare clause of the Constitution to devote any Government property or machinery it may have in its possession or under its control to such legitimate use as the people as in the judgment of Congress may seem proper.

Mr. Aldrich—That is rather a broad statement. Mr. Carter—President, I think the proposition as made will stand the test, even in the broad language in which I put it.

The "general welfare" phrase had been mentioned at the outset by Mr. Carter as his chief reliance. Mr. Lodge interposed to say that he thought Mr. Carter quite correct. He quoted from the masterly argument by the Supreme Court in the Bank case through Marshall's pen (4 Wharton, 316) this sentence, interpreting the eighteenth clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution, which when illustrated by numerals is very impressive:

Let (1) be the legitimate, let it (2) be the scope of the Constitution, and all means which (3) are appropriate, which are (4) plainly adapted to the end, which are (5) related to the general welfare, and which are (6) consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional.

Mr. Lodge did not explain that the "general welfare" phrase is only twice used in the Constitution, once in the preamble, which does not confer any power on Congress, and once in the taxing clause, which does give a power to "tax," but only for three special ends, one of which is to provide for the "general welfare" of the Government of the United States. In the Bank case, from which he quoted, the Supreme Court thus interprets that clause by inserting the words "in order before" to "pay."

Mr. Lodge can but be influenced by Story's interpretation of that "general welfare" phrase, if not by Jefferson's in his opinion given to Washington (February 15, 1781) on the Bank case. Those potential interpretations leave a small basis in the "general welfare" phrase for postal savings depositories. A larger basis must be found.

Mr. Heyburn, a Republican from Idaho, made a penetrating criticism when he said:

The bill is carefully drawn and contains many points comprehensive in themselves, but they all seem to me to lose sight of the relation of the relation of a constitutional government, such as is ours, to the people and the relation that exists between a monarchy or other character of government to its people.

It had already been said that the half million of dollars annually given by Congress to the Attorney-General for the detection and punishment of offences by interstate railways, the million of dollars, more or less, annually expended by the Interstate Commerce Commission for a similar purpose and its power to "employ special counsel," the large sums paid out by the Bureau of Corporations and its authority to remunerate lawyers have created a large force of legal gentlemen who argue railroad cases in behalf of the United States. Presumably those worthy members of the bar are like the postmasters promoting the nomination of Mr. Taft at Chicago. It is not to be assumed that each of that great host of special counsel is permitted to ask the Federal Judge to declare as railroad law every proposition he sees fit to expound. The President nor the Attorney-General, neither the President nor the Attorney-General representing the President overhauls the briefs of those lawyers who argue in behalf of the Administration and applies a blue pencil to unsound propositions. Therefore the interpretations of railroad statutes and of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution for which those lawyers contend must be taken as the interpretations of the President and his Administration.

When the interesting debate on the postal depositories was at an end and it did seem to me quite ludicrous that Republican lawyers and Senators, who had swallowed submissively and gracefully the Administration's interpretation of the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution and of

the Hepburn law of 1906, should make such wry faces at Mr. Carter's rather novel constitutional theories regarding useful postal savings banks. IN THE GALLERY. WASHINGTON, MAY 11.

STATE WATER RESOURCES.

Decisions That Show the United States Has No Control Over Them.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: As a hydraulic engineer and one consequently more or less conversant with our Western water laws, I beg to call your attention to a remarkable want of knowledge on this subject which seems to prevail among some writers who deal with the agitation in regard to Federal control of the water resources of our Western States.

The labor under a serious misconception of the legal status of the case when, referring to power companies that have prospered by Federal grants of water rights and of their present attempt to secure possession of other streams, they contend that these streams have been held to be navigable, and therefore not subject to interstate commerce and general welfare clauses.

The rights of the United States in respect to navigable waters are by Constitution (paragraph 8, section 8) limited to the control and regulation of commerce on the navigable waters. These rights have been subsequently defined by the Supreme Court of the United States as neither sovereign nor proprietary, but the United States "may be said to claim an easement for the transportation of merchandise." Mobile Exports (16 Peters, 277).

Again, those who express the hope that the rights of Congress and of the States speak without due consideration or investigation of the subject, as the sovereign right of the State to control all navigable water within its territorial boundary has been affirmed by the United States Supreme Court in numerous cases:

Marlin vs. Waddell (16 Peters, 410). Mobile vs. Esch (16 Peters, 259). Pollard vs. Hagan (16 Peters, 220).

Granting the indisputable fact that the classic water laws of our Western States require prompt consideration and revision to meet present day conditions, it is readily seen that this cannot be accomplished by judicial decisions of the Supreme Court. The only satisfactory solution of the problem is to be obtained by cooperative legislation on the part of our various States acting in conjunction with our National Congress.

WILLIAM R. KING, M. E. NEW YORK, MAY 11.

The New York Policeman as the Citizen's Friend.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Your correspondent at Litchfield, Conn., who comes to the defense of the police force of this city as against "R. S." is barking up the wrong tree. The police are all right, but what is to be done with cattle of the "R. S." breed? In my experience of human intercourse (and policemen are human) a man gets out of a conversation his correct change in the same coin that he brings, and more than probable that the courteous answer received by "R. S." to his tenth query was in response to the first question asked by him as one real man asks a question of another real man.

Like "R. S.," I have been away from here five years. Returning to my former city, I have had much occasion to avail myself of what I found to be the unfailing kindness and thoughtfulness of policemen in many different parts of the city. CHARLES S. PUTNAM. NEW YORK, MAY 11.

Millitant Wealth in Minnesota.

From the Eastern Daily Argus. It is estimated that the anti-Johnson campaign in Minnesota has cost \$5,000 a day. There is naturally some speculation where the money comes from.

Model Villages in Hungary.

Budapest correspondence Full Mill Gazette. The progress of the Agricultural Ministry in dealing with the formation of new villages and of repossessing those suffering seriously from decline goes on apace in Hungary. Report just received shows that the State has allotted 32,574 acres of its own property for sixteen settlements, on which 1,500 families have been given new homes.

Two new model villages have been formed named "Gardens and Villages" and "Gardens and Villages" and have been resuscitated. Several interesting features demand attention. For instance, the expenses of a church are the more easily borne because the inhabitants of such a village settlement are usually of the same religious faith. Life is more bearable within these protected or aided areas. Land good land is cheaper.

Terms of purchase extend over a long period, and the interest in Transylvania is 2 per cent. In some of the other districts to 4 per cent. More than 2,500,000 crowns have been repaid by the new settlers and only 150,000 crowns of the purchase money remains outstanding.

In the selection of the new villages great care is shown and all are subjected to a severe examination. In many cases the new farmers have been supplied gratis with seeds, fruit trees and cattle for breeding purposes, and special funds have been provided for the laying out and making of new roads.

Pennsylvania Giant Pine.

From the Ridgely Daily Record. A giant white pine tree cut in Cameron county which produced the following number and length of logs: Twelve 16 foot logs, two 14 foot logs, eight 12 foot logs, three 10 foot logs and six 8 foot logs, and the whole bunch scaled the magnificent total of 10,800 feet board measure. The butt log measured 60 inches, or 5 feet, in diameter at the base. The tree was not 30 feet high, as it would seem from the figures, but had two forks and three branches of immense size, hence the large number of logs. The tree was cut down during the deepest snow of the last winter, and hence it was not much broken because the snow denuded the fall.

Only Negro Forester.

From the Philadelphia Record. Among the many ways in which Southern Franklins county status and the color of the soil is the fact that in this section is located the only colored forester in the United States, and probably the only one in the world, with the exception of a few engaged in forestry work in South Africa.